

August 8, 1967

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 11129

to the pending measure, and I wish to associate myself with his remarks with regard to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, natural rivers are a part of our national heritage and should be preserved. Many of our remaining free-flowing rivers are under threat of pollution, impoundment and other destructive assault. The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has given the matter thorough study and now recommends this bill to establish a national wild and scenic rivers system.

Last year, a similar measure was approved by the Senate by a vote of 71 to 1. This year's bill, S. 119, which I co-sponsored, is broadened to provide for two categories of rivers; "wild" for sparsely populated, rugged areas; and "scenic" for more accessible but still pastoral areas.

It is pleasing to note that the entire Eleven Point River, all the way from its headwaters at Thomasville, Mo., to the Black River in Arkansas, has been recommended as a scenic river.

S. 119 would also designate 27 other rivers, including the Gasconade in central Missouri, as candidates for future inclusion in the national system.

I am glad to support this measure, and hope that it will soon be enacted into law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order previously entered, the time to vote on the bill has arrived.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is absent on official business and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 208 Leg.]

YEAS—84

Aiken	Hart	Mondale
Allott	Hartke	Monroney
Anderson	Hatfield	Montoya
Baker	Hayden	Morse
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Morton
Bennett	Hill	Moss
Bible	Holland	Mundt
Boggs	Hollings	Murphy
Brewster	Hruska	Nelson
Brooke	Inouye	Pastore
Burdick	Jackson	Pearson
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Percy
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Prouty
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Proxmire
Case	Kennedy, Mass.	Randolph
Church	Kennedy, N.Y.	Ribicoff
Clark	Kuchel	Smathers
Cooper	Lausche	Smith
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Curtis	Long, La.	Symington
Dirksen	Magnuson	Talmadge
Dominick	Mansfield	Thurmond
Ellender	McCarthy	Tower
Ervin	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Fannin	McGovern	Williams, Del.
Fong	McIntyre	Yarborough
Griffin	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Hansen	Miller	Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—16

Bayh	Gruening	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Harris	Spong
Dodd	McGee	Stennis
Eastland	Muskie	Tydings
Fulbright	Pell	
Gore	Russell	

So the bill (S. 119) was passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to reserve certain public lands for a National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, to provide a procedure for adding additional public lands and other lands to the system, and for other purposes."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] has again successfully handled a measure of vital importance to the Nation insofar as it preserves for all Americans some of the most beautiful natural waterways on this continent. His flawless management of the bill, S. 119, which establishes a system of national wild and scenic rivers, produced its endorsement by all Members.

His long and persistent efforts lead the way for the success of this measure; appropriately, it drew nothing short of unanimous approval—an outstanding achievement for Senator CHURCH and for the preservation of our ever diminishing wilderness areas. The Senate and indeed the Nation are most grateful. If finally enacted, ours and all future generations shall benefit because of his strong efforts.

Joining Senator CHURCH to assure unanimous adoption by the Senate was his colleague from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN]. Like Senator CHURCH, Senator JORDAN has been consistently committed to the preservation and maintenance of the Nation's natural resources, including its magnificent wilderness areas. He too worked long and hard for today's success and deserves the Senate's high commendation.

The junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the able and outstanding chairman of the Committee on the Interior, is similarly to be commended. He contributed immensely to the discussion, offered his clear and convincing views and supported the measure with typically capable advocacy. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] deserves equally high commendation. His efforts produced the assurance of consideration of another natural waterway for inclusion in the proposed national river system. We are grateful.

Other Senators also joined the discussion. Noteworthy were the views added by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. Their interest is always welcome; their analysis always thoughtful. The Senate may be proud of another fine achievement gained with such generous consideration for the views of all Members that unanimous approval on final passage was a certainty.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, our action today in approving by a unanimous vote the wild and scenic rivers bill will preserve certain portions of our rivers in their original condition for the benefit and pleasure of present and future generations of Americans. I am pleased to join in support of this important measure. I have personally traveled a number of these rivers and can attest to their great natural beauty and an excitement which must be preserved for future generations of Americans.

As our needs for power generation, navigation, water supply, and irrigation increase—and they will increase at a staggering rate in the remaining years of the 20th century—we will find it necessary to modify many of our rivers and lakes.

This modification will materially change the nature of these rivers, in some cases flooding rivers for navigation purposes, and in other cases artificially lowering rivers during certain periods of the year for irrigation purposes. I am sure that we will support these modifications as they are required. Navigation, creation of reservoirs, additional power generation are important aspects of our daily life and commerce.

However, because of the many pressures for use of our rivers, pressures that are increasing as our population grows and its needs increase, it becomes doubly important that we designate at this time, those rivers that we wish to preserve or return to their original condition.

These rivers can offer to present and future generations recreational, scenic and spiritual value that would not be gained elsewhere.

If these rivers are not so designated at this time, we will not be able to go back and re-create their original state. Once a dam is built, a river is straightened, or water control systems are built for irrigation purposes, we cannot reverse our actions.

This is why it is important to designate portions of the Salmon, the Clearwater, the Rogue, the Rio Grande, the Green, and the Suwannee as parts of a national wild rivers system. The beauty and grandeur of these rivers is eloquent

S11130

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

August 8, 1967

testimony in itself as to why they should be included in this system.

In addition to the rivers listed for initial inclusion in the wild rivers system, certain other rivers are designated for possible inclusion at a later date, should the State and Federal agencies concerned agree that this is desirable and feasible.

One of these rivers is the East Fork of the Susquehanna from Cooperstown, N.Y., to Pittston, Pa. I would like very much to see this river included.

Some of these other rivers are located in more built-up areas where both private and public developments have already somewhat modified the character of the river. In this sense they have already been partially tamed. It may not be possible to include the entire portion of the river within the system. It may also be necessary to modify the provisions of the system for each of these additional rivers so that the best solution for the individual river is reached.

I am sure that New York State and municipal officials will work closely together with the appropriate Federal agencies to determine under what conditions the East Fork of the Susquehanna can be included in the wild rivers system. I know that full consideration will be given to the individual requirements on each of these rivers.

I know also that the people of New York State and the surrounding States are interested in preserving some of our rivers in their wild state—and for those of you from the West that do not think the upper Hudson or the Susquehanna can be wild, I extend an invitation for a personal inspection—for their pleasure and for the pleasure of future generations. They know that the major population growth in the remainder of this century will take place close to existing urban areas. They know that we must act now if we are to conserve these portions of our natural heritage.

Our action today is an important step toward preserving the natural beauty of our rivers. The benefits of this action will be enjoyed by all Americans for generations. These rivers will be enjoyed for their scenic splendor and for their recreational value. By this action, we improve the quality of our environment, and that improvement contributes to a better quality of life for all of us.

## A TIME FOR EVALUATION

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I address myself to the problem we face of insuring adequate money to carry out responsibilities for vital domestic programs and the Vietnam war, while keeping the Federal deficit from ballooning to the monstrous size the administration is now unhappily predicting.

In order to fulfill all our responsibilities, some say we must increase taxes; others say there are numerous instances where spending can and should be reduced. At the outset, I am inclined to support the latter course, and I wish to point out an area where nearly 2 billion taxpayer dollars might be freed from a presently wasteful use, where cynical political maneuvering might be elimi-

nated, and where the livelihood of this Nation's second largest industry might be freed from dependence on the Government for its sustenance.

I refer to our current farm programs and to the funds—nearly \$2 billion in 1966—paid directly to wheat and feed grain producers in the form of price supports and diversion payments.

An increasing amount of mail from agricultural constituents and consumers in my State has convinced me we need to take a close look at the inequities and future direction of our farm policy.

I have observed the impact of the wheat and feed grains program, and its influence in my own State on livestock production; and I have attempted to study its complexities and implications.

As I recall, the programs were originally enacted for the purpose of reducing huge post-war surpluses by paying farmers to divert acres from production. While it appeared to provide the answer to a problem many years ago, the wheat and feed grains program is now outmoded, extremely costly, and totally unnecessary in light of the present overall situation.

Although huge Government-held surpluses have largely disappeared, this has been more the result of greatly increased exports than the effectiveness of the program. In fact, production under this program has been higher than before it was initiated. There are numerous instances where diversion payments have gone to producers for land that would not have produced wheat or feed grains without the program. These payments have helped finance yield-increasing practices on the remaining acreage.

ASCS offices in eastern soft-wheat areas currently are purchasing large amounts of wheat to be added to CCC stocks, because overproduction has caused a lack of storage facilities and the prices have fallen below the local loan rate.

Some paradoxes exist which would have been almost amusing, were they not so serious in their effect. Farmers are harder hit than ever by skyrocketing costs and lower prices for their products, largely due to the inequities of the very programs designed to solve their problems.

The Government spends nearly \$2 billion in payments to wheat and feed grain producers to reduce yield; while simultaneously spending untold amounts in scientific and technological research to encourage more production on less land.

What do farmers think about Government farm programs? Farm Journal, a nationally known agricultural magazine, conducted polls of its rural readers in 1959, 1962, and 1966. The results, even though limited to the opinions of about 19,000 farmers, came from all the States and represented all the various cross-sections of agriculture.

The final count revealed the following statistics with respect to Government price supports and controls:

In the 1959 poll, 55 percent voted for no supports and no controls;

In 1962, 52 percent rejected supports and controls; and,

In 1966, 63 percent voted to get the

Government out of the business of farm price supports and controls, while 27 percent voted for "some supports." Only 10 percent thought programs should be continued as they are.

Several years ago when a producer referendum was held, the majority of wheat and feed grain producers voted overwhelmingly against Government controls. Congress then enacted a voluntary program, and in order to encourage participation, the Government used various means—including the dumping of surplus stocks on the market to depress prices—to induce producers to sign up.

Obviously, the majority of farmers would prefer to produce what they feel they can sell, and take their knocks in the marketplace without having to depend on political manipulations in Washington for a large portion of their income.

If the farmers do not want the program, and if repealing it would save the taxpayers money, then there is no justification for failing to give serious and objective consideration to the merits of a market-oriented system. It is time to re-examine and reevaluate the wheat and feed grains program.

*Allen Jones*  
IMPLEMENTATION OF IMMIGRATION REFORM ACT OF 1965

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, section 203 (a) (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides for the conditional entry of refugees into the United States. The language of that provisions reads as follows:

(7) Conditional entries shall next be made available by the Attorney General, pursuant to such regulations as he may prescribe and in a number not to exceed 6 per centum of the number specified in section 201(a) (11), to aliens who satisfy an Immigration and Naturalization Service officer at an examination in any non-Communist or non-Communist-dominated country, (A) that (i) because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion they have fled (I) from any Communist or Communist-dominated country or area, or (II) from any country within the general area of the Middle East, and (ii) are unable or unwilling to return to such country or area on account of race, religion, or political opinion, and (iii) are not nationals of the countries or areas in which their application for conditional entry is made; or (B) that they are persons uprooted by catastrophic natural calamity as defined by the President who are unable to return to their usual place of abode. For the purpose of the foregoing the term "general area of the Middle East" means the area between and including (1) Libya on the west, (2) Turkey on the north, (3) Pakistan on the east, and (4) Saudi Arabia and Ethiopia on the south: *Provided*, That immigrant visas in a number not exceeding one-half the number specified in this paragraph may be made available, in lieu of conditional entries of a like number, to such aliens who have been continuously physically present in the United States for a period of at least two years prior to application for adjustment of status.

Mr. President, on July 12, 1967, I sent a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk strongly protesting the Department's partial implementation of this section 203(a) (7) of the Immigration Reform Act of 1965.

I pointed out at that time that by establishing refugee offices in six Euro-